THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume IX, No. 6 † September 1, 1988

JOHN PAUL II IS NOT A VALID POPE!!!

Fr. Francis E. Fenton

Yes, I know that I have expressed the above conviction in one way or another many times in recent years in various articles in this newsletter—but it now looks as though this persistence is gradually proving to have been worthwhile.

Granted, none of the articles could even remotely be described as an in-depth presentation of the subject but merely an attempt to present in concise form a few examples and arguments in support of the fact that John Paul II is a non-Pope. While I assuredly do not mean to depreciate in the slightest the place and the value of scholarly, comprehensive, well-researched discussions of various vital subjects (at which Mr. Weiskittel is an expert), I do believe that a firm, binding case can be made on some matters in rather simple fashion—and I think that the question of John Paul II is such. If this be true, the advantage is that more people are likely to understand and to concur.

Nor do I see any imperative need of Canon Law to show beyond all reasonable doubt that John Paul II is a formal heretic and, therefore, not a legitimate Pope. A number of canons are very applicable, and most certainly should be quoted in any comprehensive writing on the subject, to fortify the accusation of formal heresy. My contention here is merely that a solid commonsense case can be made in support of the charge that John Paul II is a counterfeit Pope without having any recourse to any statements of Canon Law pertaining to the question. The *accumulated* record of his many heretical words and deeds over the past nearly ten years is far more than enough to condemn him. There is, for example, his frequent support and promotion of the utterly spurious non-Catholic Declaration on Religious Liberty of Vatican Council II and the abomination which he permitted and encouraged at Assisi, Italy, on October 27, 1986, where, thanks to the "Vicar of Christ," false ecumenism and religious indifferentism had a field day.

More recently, there was the meeting in Rome in December, 1987, of John Paul II and Orthodox Patriarch Dimitrios I of Constantinople. On that occasion, in addition to various "ecumenical" statements and actions, they recited the Nicene Creed together. But the Nicene Creed contains a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Faith (*Filioque*) which is rejected by the Orthodox. Word has it that John Paul II merely omitted that word in the recitation. If so, is not this at least an implicit denial of that doctrine?

In the course of that same meeting John Paul II and Patriarch Dimitrios issued a joint statement rejecting "every form of proselytizing, every attitude which would be or could be perceived as a lack of respect." In reference to religion, to proselytize means to recruit or convert to a particular faith or religious body. In this statement, then, "His Holiness," rejects any form of seeking or gaining converts which would be or could be considered disrespectful. Since John Paul II is an expert in the use of ambiguous language (an essential tactic in his case), I'm not sure what is meant here but I think he is saying that conversions must not be sought if the procedure employed is or may be lacking in propriety to some even small degree. In other words, do not attempt to convert a person if there is any risk that your "form of proselytizing" may be considered disrespectful by someone, say, the Patriarch of Constantinople. Well, if such a rule were in effect back in the 1950's when there were some 100,000 converts a year in the USA to the true Church, that number, I submit, would be substantially less. Anyway, the purpose of this paragraph is simply to note the obvious lack of concern for converts on the part of the man who is believed by millions in the Conciliar Church to be the Vicar of Christ. Don't try to convert someone if your method of doing so might possibly be offensive to a third party! This hardly reflects the mind of the Roman Catholic Church—but it's great "ecumenism"!

The concepts of false religious liberty, religious indifferentism, "ecumenism," humanism, the Masonic "brotherhood of man," etc., have been expressed time and time again in the statements, sermons, discourses, writings and actions of John Paul II. That at least some of these constitute material heresy even some of his Conciliar Church members concede. But to admit John Paul II's material heresy while denying formal heresy on his part is equivalent to saying that, yes, certain things he has said and done are indeed heretical but he has not said or done these things knowingly and willingly and obstinately—and so is not guilty of formal heresy. In other words, his heresies have been committed innocently, "in good faith," as a consequence of ignorance of the teachings of the Church. Such an argument is utterly absurd, is it not? That being the case, John Paul II is unquestionably a formal heretic and, as such, a non-Pope. Why, he isn't even a Roman Catholic since formal heresy excludes one from membership in the Church.

But, besides being a non-Pope and a non-Catholic, could it be that John Paul II is actually a conscious, dedicated enemy of the Church and indeed one of the most powerful and influential of those enemies? There are some (many?) who are strongly inclined towards this belief—and I am one of them. Certainly, no one individual in recent years has done more that he has in laying the groundwork and creating the climate for a New World Church as part of the New World Order. And once a person arrives at the conviction that John Paul II is neither a valid Pope nor a Roman Catholic and at least strongly suspects that he may in fact be a prime mover in the top echelon in the camp of the enemy—then that person well understands why (among numerous examples that could be offered) John Paul II has never so much as mentioned the word Communism, much less condemned it, throughout the past nearly ten years (the same is undoubtedly true in regard to Freemasonry); why there are scores of Freemasons in high positions in the Conciliar Church, including the number two man in the Vatican, the papal Secretary of State (Agostino Casaroli); why John Paul II never refers to the Catholic Church as the One True Church (hardly to be expected, of course, from a non-Catholic); why heresy abounds in the Conciliar Church while an Archbishop Lefebvre incurs "excommunication"; why, despite the pleas of multitudes in recent years, John Paul II has never fulfilled the specific conditions stated by Our Lady of Fatima relating to the consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary; and so on and so on.

But John Paul II, besides oozing charisma, is a brilliant operator, a master in the art of deception. And so he will quite often say or do something which gives the impression that he is really a Catholic—and how well he succeeds in deceiving the gullible. His record speaks for itself though—and that record is an appalling one. "Beware of false prophets, who come to you in the clothing of sheep, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. By their fruits you shall know them..." (Matthew 7:15-16)

(Remember John Paul II in your prayers each day, as I do.)†

Nelson Mandela has been in prison since 1964 when, as a leader of the Communist-dominated African National Congress, he was convicted for advocating the violent overthrow of the South African government. Evidence in that trial included a pamphlet Mandela wrote, entitled "How to be a Good Communist." In 1985, South African President Pieter Botha offered to free Mandela, saying: "The choice is his. All that is required of him is that he should unconditionally reject violence as a political instrument." That the 70-year-old Mandela remains in prison suggests his continued steadfast dedication to violent revolution.

In an interview granted to some Italian and British reporters during a July vacation in the Italian Dolomite Alps, John Paul II praised Nelson Mandela for his "greatness" of character and described him as a man who is suffering "so much for the rights of his people...With this suffering he offers a testimony to his people, even to the South African government, and to the entire world...All men are equal, regardless of their race. In this way one can see the greatness of the testimony of this personality (Mandela). These days I have thought of him in a special way."

From the above one might even suspect that the alleged Pope and the revolutionary Mandela are kindred souls.

THE ATHANASIAN

Published by Traditional Catholics of America

Eight issues a year: (Jan. 15, Mar. 1, Apr. 15, June 1, July 15, Sept. 1, Oct. 15, Dec. 1)
Subscriptions: $12.00 per year (via First Class Mail) for the USA, Canada and Mexico; $16.00 per year (via Air Mail) for all other countries
Additional copies: single copy - $1.50; 10 copies - $12.00; 40 or more to same address - $1.00 each
Mailing address: P.O. Box 38335, Colorado Springs, CO 80937
Telephone: (719) 636-1575

Manuscripts sent to us for possible publication in *The Athanasian* should be typewritten, double-spaced and no more than seven pages in length. If not accepted, they will be returned to the sender.

No articles from this newsletter may be reproduced either in whole or in part without the written permission of the TCA.

SAINT CASIMIR

Jill Wiesner

"Daily, daily sing to Mary; sing, my soul, her praises due;
All her feasts, her actions honor with the heart's devotion true.
Lost in wond'ring contemplation be her majesty confessed.
Call her Mother, call her Virgin; happy Mother, Virgin blest..."

This lovely hymn of praise to the Blessed Virgin Mary is the "Hymn of Saint Casimir." Casimir, King of Poland in the fifteenth century, carried a copy of it with him at all times and requested that, at his death, it be buried with him. His devotion to the Mother of God gave him the strength to remain pure in a time of growing immorality and to serve God while surrounded by worldliness.

The evils of Casimir's time were similar in many ways to those we face today. The Renaissance, which swept through Europe, brought with it profound change. Men were no longer guided by the spirit of the Faith but by the spirit of the world. The holy influence of the Church had been weakened by the long papal exile at Avignon and the forty-year schism, during which there were three rival claimants to the Chair of Saint Peter. Emboldened by the new spirit of "independence," the enemies of Holy Mother Church were quick to seize the opportunity to throw off her restraints. Monarchs claimed absolute authority over their subjects, declaring that the Church had no right to interfere. At the universities, professors such as John Wycliffe at Oxford and John Hus at the University of Prague taught heresy and incited their followers to violence against anyone who defended Catholic doctrine. In Italy, the "anti-clericals" fomented hatred against all religious.

Through all the unrest ran the common thread of humanism, which glorifies nature and exalts human reason. Humanism filled Catholic Europe with "false enthusiasm for pagan ideas, combined with contempt for the Church, together with a tendency to indifferentism, frivolity and obscenity...Many humanists ridiculed priests and monks and even mocked the saints." (*A Short History of the Catholic Church* by Hermann Wedewer, B. Herder Book Co., 1923)

In spite of the disorder which prevailed, Casimir was only interested in pleasing God. From early childhood he was filled with such great love for the Blessed Virgin Mary that everything he did was guided by thoughts of her. Born in 1458 in the royal palace at Cracow, Casimir was the grandson of Wladislaus II, the Polish king who had introduced Christianity into Lithuania. Casimir's uncle, Wladislaus III, had been killed at Varna in 1444, defending Christianity against the Turks. Casimir, too, was eager to defend the Faith. Though he was a charming and friendly child, he never wavered from this goal.

When Casimir was nine he and his brothers were sent to be tutored by Father John Dlugosz who, in addition to being a renowned historian and a canon at Cracow, was a good and holy priest. Aided by his instruction and example, Casimir grew in piety and virtue.

The luxury and grandeur of court life held no attraction for the young prince for his heart was set on higher things. His "two great loves" were Our Lady and the Passion of Our Lord. He spent most of each night in prayer and rose before dawn to kneel before the locked doors of the church, regardless of the weather, waiting for Matins. At Mass he was so absorbed in the Holy Sacrifice that he was unaware of everything else around him.

Though surrounded by worldly comforts, Casimir led an austere life. He fasted, wore a hair shirt and slept on the bare ground. His love for the poor caused him to give away his entire personal fortune in alms, earning for him the title "father and defender of the poor and unfortunate."

When Casimir was fifteen he was offered the throne of Hungary by a faction of Hungarian nobles who were dissatisfied with their king. Out of obedience to his father Casimir accepted the offer and marched against the king of Hungary with an army of 20,000 men. When he reached the Hungarian border, however, he learned that the Pope disapproved of the action he was taking. He immediately returned with his men to Poland and spent three months doing penance.

In 1479, Casimir's father, who was King of Poland and Lithuania, decided to divide his kingdom. He went to Lithuania and named Casimir King of Poland. For four years Casimir ruled with great prudence. Though a number of his advisers tried to convince him to marry the daughter of Frederick III, Emperor of Germany, Casimir steadfastly refused, remaining faithful to the vow of chastity he had made as a child.

In 1483, while on a journey to Lithuania, Casimir fell ill with tuberculosis. Assured by the doctors that the married state would restore him to health, he replied that he would prefer to die a virgin. On the fourth of March, in the city of Vilna in Lithuania, twenty-five-year-old Casimir died and at the hour he foretold.

Canonized in 1522 by Pope Adrian VI, Casimir is the Patron of Poland and Lithania and a model of purity for youth. One hundred and twenty-two years after his death, his tomb was reopened so that his body might be transferred to a new chapel. Though the tomb was damp and crumbling, his body was found to be incorrupt, wrapped in silk robes and emitting a fresh, sweet fragrance. Beneath his head was found his hymn to the Blessed Virgin Mary. †

GEORGE ("TWEEDLEDUM") BUSH

John Kenneth Weiskittel

During the 1980 primaries many conservatives around the country were making a fuss over the membership of Republican presidential candidate George Bush in such shadowy internationalist groups as the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and the Trilateral Commission (TC). Bush, who had officially resigned from the groups the previous year, complained to a reporter in Houston that he was tired of people "questioning my patriotism because of my association with the Trilateral Commission. But it's not a big deal, frankly."

Of course it was a big deal—and still is. When a nation is being threatened by powerful organizations in its midst that seek to tear down its sovereignty and that promote global power-sharing with Communists, it had better take notice when a man with ties to such groups bids to become its leader. Unfortunately, however, the national news media—which are well-represented in the CFR—chose not to pursue the issue with any tenacity. After gaining the GOP's nomination, Ronald Reagan took Bush as his running mate and, after winning the election, named numerous members of these groups to cabinet level positions.

Promoters of One-Worldism can be found throughout America but, because its earliest stirrings as a movement were centered in the Northeastern States and because its strength continues to emanate from there (in multinational banks and corporations, universities, foundations, think tanks and political affairs groups), it has come to be identified as the Eastern Establishment. If one were called on to submit an article on the Establishment for an encyclopedia and wished to include a photo to give readers an idea of what the "typical Establishment man" looks like, one could scarcely do better than to carry a picture of the preppy and pin-striped Vice President of the United States, George Herbert Walker Bush.

Now, after many years of service to the Establishment as congressman, United Nations Ambassador, Chairman of the Republican National Committee, Chief of the U.S. Liaison Office in Red China, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, member of the CFR's Board of Directors and U.S. Vice President, the 64-year-old Bush is the Establishment's candidate for president. The article that follows is an analysis of his record and, based on this, what kind of policies he is likely to pursue from the Oval Office.

Is Bush A Conservative?

In February, 1987, hundreds of delegates to the Conservative Political Action Conference, held in the nation's capital, received a campaign mailing in a plain envelope. Inside they found that it came from an anonymous "Conservative Truth Squad" and read, "We don't need another two-faced sellout politician" and "Jack Kemp is trying to pass himself off as the conservative candidate." At the same time this was happening, Bush campaign consultant Craig Shirley resigned in disgust, in large part because the phantom letter came from the Bush camp. (Fred Barnes, "Republican Dirty Tricks," *The New Republic*, July 27, 1987) If Bush knew of this act by his operatives (or authorized it), it would be a classic example of the pot calling the kettle black.

New York Times columnist James Reston writes that, for Bush "(t)o be nominated in a Republican convention dominated by the conservative wing of his party, he needs the support of the President, the conservative delegates and the television preachers." (*Washington*, Macmillan, 1986, p. 210) To an extent he has already been able to satisfy some conservatives that he is no longer the Establishment "liberal" who supported abortion and the Equal Rights Amendment, gun control, détente, Red China over Taiwan, and big government in general, including a guaranteed-income welfare plan. As for the other potential barriers mentioned by Reston, Bush has hurdled these by gaining President Reagan's endorsement as well as those of the Rev. Jerry Falwell and preacher-turned-politico, Pat Robertson.

But other conservatives aren't leaping on the Bush bandwagon. The *Washington Times*, on February 10, 1988, carried a full-page ad sponsored by the Conservative Caucus and its chairman, Howard Phillips, that attacked Bush over his support of the INF Treaty. Bush's claim that "(t)he Soviets will destroy four times as many warheads as the U.S." was, it charged, "either recklessly ignorant or consciously inaccurate" because, according to the treaty's terms:

> No warhead destruction is required. 429 U.S. and 1,667 Soviet missile casings will be destroyed if the INF Treaty is ratified...The American warheads will be sent back to the U.S. The Soviet warheads will be available for reuse on Soviet SS-24 or SS-25 missiles, to which they can be rebolted with minor modifications. America will be left with zero theater-based missiles capable of hitting Soviet territory. The Soviets will retain 92%-plus of what they have now aimed at Europe and the West...According to a Foreign Relations Committee Republican staff analysis, the INF Treaty preserves 3,136 Soviet warheads to 931 for the U.S., a ratio of 3.4 to 1. Expressed in terms of nuclear explosive power preserved, the ratio is 12-1 in the Soviets' favor.

For his part, Bush has said Phillips and direct-mail specialist Richard Viguerie (who has given him lukewarm support) represent a "fringe" element in the party and that "it doesn't matter in terms of total votes" whether or not they decide to

back him. (cited, "Bush brushes off influence of GOP 'fringe' conservatives," *Tampa Tribune*, June 2, 1988) Both Viguerie and Phillips played key roles in mobilizing conservative support for Ronald Reagan's successful 1980 campaign.

The most distressing thing about the 1988 race may prove to be that George Bush can pose as a conservative with little fear of being detected by the electorate. It appears that leftist Arthur Schlesinger was correct when he observed that in American politics "liberalism grows constantly *more* liberal and, by the same token, conservatism grows constantly *less* conservative." (cited, Gary Allen, *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, Concord Press, 1972, p. 27. Emphasis added—JKW)

The Flip-Flop Man

To be certain, Bush has given some signals to the right that he is their best hope. Perhaps the most significant has been his abrupt about-face on abortion: throughout his public career he had favored liberalized abortion laws—but then he met Reagan, "saw the light," and has since become a vocal pro-life advocate.

In sizing up Bush, the *National Right to Life News* of January 22, 1988, reported that he supports the Hatch, Garn/Oberstar and Humphrey/Luken amendments "if exceptions are added for assault rape and incest," and opposes federal funding of abortion "except to save the life of the mother." It also notes that, in his 1984 debate with Geraldine Ferraro, he "spoke out against abortion" and has "used his influence to aid the pro-life cause." Whether his change is genuine—or merely the ploy of a crass opportunist hunting for votes—remains to be seen; only when he has the power of the presidency can anyone know with any degree of certainty. The fact remains that the conditions in which he *still* favors abortion make his position unacceptable in light of Catholic teaching.

But this is hardly his first reversal of a stated position. His career has had more flip-flops than a trout out of water. Bush attacked the "voodoo economics" of Reagan during the campaign and then, as Vice President, became the "witch doctor's" assistant. Also during the 1980 race he claimed to oppose gun control after having voted for the 1968 Gun Control Act as a Texas congressman. When running for the seat in 1964 Bush stated that, "(i)f Red China is admitted to the United Nations, then the U.N. is hopeless and we should withdraw," but seven years later he sought its admission, saying the U.S. must have "normalized relations with China as soon as possible." (cited, Antony Sutton, *Two Faces of George Bush*,, Wiswell Ruffin House, 1988, p. 35) On a tour of Red China, *Current Biography* tells us, Vice President Bush

> reassured his hosts in Peking that Reagan's expression of support for restoring official government relations between Washington and Taipei, which had been ended with the American recognition of the People's Republic in 1979, represented neither the Republican platform nor Reagan's actual intentions, and went on to explain that Reagan's references to Taiwan, which mainland Chinese consider a province, as a "country" and as the "Republic of China" were simply phrases used "out of habit." (p. 40.)

Rarely will you see this reporter or anyone associated with *The Athanasian* agreeing with *Time*, but it seems to have hit upon the truth in its February 22, 1982 issue when it alluded thus to Bush's pragmatism: "His conduct suggests that he has expedient political positions, not deeply held convictions." And, as Professor Sutton points out, that publication "can hardly be accused of being anti-Bush. After all, the journal itself was founded by a dozen members of Skull & Bones, the Bush family fraternity at Yale." (op cit)

The Clubmen

The issue of George Bush's membership in Skull & Bones has yet to be exploited by the Democrats or even seriously explored by the media. Yet this ultrasecret fraternity boasts many Establishment figures (past and present): JFK's National Security director and Ford Foundation president McGeorge Bundy (also CFR); ambassador for Democratic presidents from FDR to LBJ and New York Governor Averell Harriman (CFR); radical Presbyterian minister William Sloane Coffin, Jr.; "conservative" writer William F. Buckley, Jr. (CFR); Senator John Heinz (R-PA); Senator John F. Kerry (D-MA); and "Doonesbury" cartoonist Garry Trudeau.

Members take part in "apparently satanic initiation rites" and "are sworn to absolute secrecy. They may not admit membership nor may they even discuss membership in the presence of nonmembers." (Sutton, p. 14) In response to a letter inquiring about Bush's relations with Skull & Bones, the Vice President's press secretary, in a duplicitous fashion worthy of the Masons, would neither confirm nor deny his membership, but would only write that Bush never belonged to a "sordid secret society" and advised the correspondent to contact "Yale University directly." (ibid. The key here is the "hedge" word *sordid* for Bush can easily argue, "Well, *I* see nothing sordid in this group—it's all in how you perceive it.") As far as perceptions go, Prescott Bush (George's father and a U.S. Senator) and E. Roland Harriman (Averell's brother), both bankers and Skull & Bones men of an earlier era, saw nothing wrong with dealing with the Soviets and, with a third fraternity member, also financed trade with the Nazis. (ibid, p. 11.)

George Bush seems drawn to "clubs" with an internationalist outlook. Beside the CFR and TC, he has also belonged to the Atlantic Council. Yet he denies being a globalist. When explaining why he resigned the Trilateral Commission, he mentioned his war medals and stated: "Clearly, I would never have belonged to any organization that had devious designs or favored one-world government." (Sutton,

p. 41. Professor Sutton contends that official documents of the TC plainly show it *does* favor globalism and that, therefore, "either Bush was lying to his inquirers, or terribly naive.") Why, then, in 1970, in his post as U.N. Ambassador, did he praise an American city for proclaiming itself to be a *world city* governed by the U.S. charter? (ibid, p. 38. At a formal ceremony in Richfield, Ohio, on November 22, 1970, Sutton writes, "city officials abandoned their oaths of office and raised the United Nations flag alongside the U.S. flag." Bush sent a "message of congratulations.")

Being a club member means getting to "pal around with the gang." When a funeral was held in the Kremlin at the death of Soviet dictator Konstantin Chernenko in March, 1985, Bush happened to run into his old friend Armand Hammer, the "capitalist" comrade, in a gathering afterwards that gave visiting dignitaries an opportunity to meet their hosts. "Armand," joked Bush, "what are you doing near the end of the line? I thought you'd be at the head." The "curiously informal and unsolemn occasion," recalls Hammer, "felt like the meeting of an intimate club to bury one of its members." (from his autobiography, *Hammer*, Putnam, 1987, p. 495) Some club!

What To Expect From A Bush Administration

Shrewd politician that he is, George Bush has recognized that his best chance in November is to cash in on the popularity of Ronald Reagan. Hence, he has made it clear that he intends to be a continuer of the present policies. "I want to be the follow-up President," he explains, "who negotiates a whole range of treaties." (cited, Phoebe Courtney, "Is Bush a Puppet of CFR?", *Tax Fax No.* 221, 1988)

Further indicators of the tenor of a Bush presidency can be seen in the following remarks: Bush has called mass murderer and Red dictator of Zimbabwe, Robert Mugabe, "a genuine statesman"; hailed Yugoslavia as "completely independent" and "truly nonaligned"; praised Rumania for its "independence" and "prosperity"; toasted Janos Kadar, the Hungarian ruler who betrayed his nation to the Soviets during the 1956 revolt, as a "man of enormous capacity and leadership capability"; and spoke of the "*allegedly*" wicked acts of the KGB. (Sutton, pp. 44-47; Emphasis added—JKW) And, lest it is believed Bush no longer runs with the CFR/TC crowd, Insider David Rockefeller, who contributed to Bush in 1980 and has likely done the same in 1988, remarked earlier this year: "He (Bush) has since spoken to the Council and the Trilateral and has been *fully supportive* of their activities. Even though he resigned, he hasn't walked away from them." (cited, Courtney, Emphasis added—JKW)

George Bush is counting on conservatives to vote him into the White House and has quipped that they won't be voting for Dukakis. And some undoubtedly will vote for Bush. What these voters fail to realize, however, is that the Vice President's hidden agenda for America *is every bit as deadly* as the open liberalism of his Democratic foe. For there is no reason to believe that George Bush would be any different as president than what he has been throughout his career—an Establishment "team player" who carries out its game plan to a tee. †

Pray the Rosary Daily

SUBSCRIPTION RENEWALS

The date on the envelope address label indicates the month and year in which the recipient's subscription is due for renewal. At the proper time, a subscription envelope will be enclosed with the newsletter. One may enter a new subscription at any time, of course, and will then receive the eight following newsletter issues. †

NEEDED: FINANCIAL SUPPORT

An article, "A Necessary Request," in the June 1, 1988 issue of *The Athanasian* was an appeal for funds for the TCA. The result was very disappointing. Only about seven percent of our newsletter subscribers responded to the request at all and what was received would just about cover our TCA expenses for some six weeks. (Expenses are roughly $4,300 per month.) In view of the many letters which come to us commending *The Athanasian*, I was so very confident that an appeal for funds would be highly successful. Apparently though, words of commendation and encouragement are one thing; financial support is something else again. In any case, if this newsletter is in fact the fine and much needed publication so very many of its subscribers assure us it is, I again ask for financial assistance sufficient to operate the TCA—and thereby to guarantee the continuing publication of *The Athanasian*.

—Fr. F. Fenton

MICHAEL ("TWEEDLEDEE") DUKAKIS

John Kenneth Weiskittel

When Massachusetts Governor and Democratic presidential candidate Michael Dukakis announced Texas Senator Lloyd Bentsen as his running mate, he took the opportunity to remind supporters that in 1960 a ticket from the same states defeated a Republican ticket headed by a vice president. Bentsen also evoked the "Boston-Austin axis," telling delegates at the 79th NAACP convention in Washington, D.C.: "No one did more for civil rights than Jack Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson."

This is to be expected—a party on the rebound always seeks to connect with the glories of its past. No one would imagine that they would call to mind, say, the Mondale-Ferraro disaster. And yet it is another Democrat that Dukakis calls to mind even more, and that is Jimmy Carter.

Aside from their common home state and, of course, their liberalism, about all Dukakis and Kennedy share are their alma mater (Harvard) and the fact that their ethnic or religious background was viewed as a potential barrier to electability (Dukakis is of Greek descent; Kennedy was an Irish Catholic). But Kennedy was a nationally-known figure *before* he ran for president, being a U.S. Senator and the author of the bestseller, *Profiles in Courage*. Dukakis, on the other hand, joins Carter in the ranks of candidates who, as governors, were largely unknown outside their regions. Also like Carter, Dukakis has done nothing to correct the media-nurtured misconception that he is a fiscal conservative.

In point of fact, to call Michael Dukakis a "liberal" is putting it quite charitably. He is, when one substitutes clam chowder for chitlings, a hardline *leftist* in the same mold as Jesse Jackson. This study will separate the *real* Michael Dukakis from the hoopla.

Governor "Do-tax-us"

Much has been made this election year about Dukakis' efficiency as an administrator and, consistent with the sort of boasting peculiar to politicians on the stump, the 54-year-old governor is leading the way. He told reporters in June that, in "sharp contrast" to the Reagan Administration, he had balanced nine state budgets while serving as Massachusetts chief executive. "(Reagan) increased the federal debt by more than all the Presidents from George Washington to Jimmy Carter combined," Dukakis stated on an earlier occasion, adding, "...I'm supposed to be a 'liberal,' and I balance budgets."

Strong words, but an observation by the *Boston Herald* on December 29, 1987, takes some of the luster off this claim: "Dukakis' boast...is brittle: Massachusetts law *requires* a balanced budget. But less easily brushed aside is Dukakis' solid record of relentlessly pushing spending up while fighting vigorously to keep taxes from going down." True to form, on June 23 of this year he signed a $40 million cigarette tax and favored $75 million in other new taxes. (It is called "Taxachusetts" for a reason!) But, Dukakis backers would argue, this is a small price to pay for the kind of recovery he has brought to the state's economy.

Here, again, claims can be deceiving. A number of factors enter into Massachusetts' "economic miracle" and Governor Mike Dukakis would not rank high on the list. First, *all* New England is enjoying the boom, including states like Connecticut and New Hampshire, which do so without a "hands-on" interventionist governor. Second, in 1980 Massachusetts voters passed Proposition 2½ (a measure opposed by Dukakis) which dropped the State's tax rate from 11 percent above the national average to 10 percent below. Third, defense contracts rose there from $1.6 billion in 1982 to the current figure of over $7 billion. And fourth, it was stimulated by the pro-business approach of his predecessor, Edward King.

For an idea of what to expect here from a Dukakis presidency, one need only look at his record as governor. In his first campaign in 1974 he promised it would be a "lead-pipe cinch" that he wouldn't increase taxes, yet when elected he immediately sought and received passage of a "temporary" 10 percent income tax surcharge which, when added to existing taxes, pushed the tax burden to 24 percent over the national average (it was revoked by referendum *in 1986*). Since returning to office in 1982, Dukakis has presided over a state spending increase of more than 60 percent—and Massachusetts now faces a $500 million deficit for Fiscal Year 1989. In 1983, he unveiled an Education and Training program (ET) that would enable welfare recipients to become self-sufficient but, through 1986, despite pouring over $80 million into it, the state's caseload has *risen*. Mark D. Isaacs, writing in *The New American* for April 27, 1987, reveals that according to *"Wall Street Journal* estimates...the annual cost of implementing ET on the national level would be $1.5 to $2.5 billion." Another Dukakis experiment voters can expect to be expanded nationwide is mandatory health care to be paid by private employers. The newly-passed laws in Massachusetts will cost upwards to $2 billion a year by 1993 and, if adopted throughout the U.S., the projected price tag is $28 billion.

Quotations from Chairman Mike

If Dukakis is elected, America can look forward to not only a further broadening of socialism domestically but also to the expansion of Communism around the globe. As president, he would put stiffer sanctions on South Africa and work for a speeding up of the betrayal of Nicaraguan resistance. He also supports removal of U.S. troops from South Korea.

Such views are by no means new. When visiting Red China in 1985, he returned a toast to his Communist hosts in Canton, explaining:

> I was a 13-year-old boy at the Baker School in Brookline (Massachusetts) and I was asked to debate changes in China. I delivered a ringing condemnation of the Kuomintang and strongly advocated revolution in China. So you see, you have a friend here. In fact, some friends of President Reagan occasionally refer to Massachusetts as the People's Republic of Massachusetts.

As syndicated columnist John F. McManus has written, the teenaged Dukakis' defense of Mao Tse-tung "was given in 1947 when Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang forces had not yet learned that the U.S. government would fully betray them."

Dukakis plays no favorites, however, when it comes to Communist regimes. In July, 1985, writes Elizabeth Drummey in the February 15, 1988 *New American*, he

> endorsed the 12th Annual "Festival of Youth and Students" at Lenin Stadium in Moscow. The sponsors of that event were striving "for anti-imperialist solidarity, peace and friendship," with a clear intent to bash America. After giving a warm send-off to the Massachusetts delegation, the Governor was asked if he were aware of the event's Communist sponsors. He responded: "When you are trying to build some international understanding, we do what we can do."

Look for a great deal more in the way of U.S./Soviet joint activities to build "understanding" under a President Dukakis.

On defense, Dukakis has used the issue of Pentagon waste to frame his opposition to the B-1 bomber, MX missile and the "Star Wars" defense system—options he vilifies as "a bunch of right-wing choices." He backs a nuclear freeze and the dangerous INF Treaty and, doubtless, as president would look for every chance for intensified negotiations with Mikhail Gorbachev. In a move away from his previous position, Dukakis told a meeting of the internationalist Atlantic Council on June 14 that he was not fully committed to defense cuts and wanted stronger conventional forces.

A Victory For The Conspiracy

Michael Stanley Dukakis stands an excellent chance of being the next president. Only about a quarter of the nation see him as even a "liberal"—and an equal percentage of Southerners polled even think he's conservative! This despite the fact that he supports "gay" rights, the E.R.A., gun control and weekend furloughs for killers; opposes school prayer, the pledge of allegiance in school (what better way to prepare today's youth for world citizenship than to destroy faith and patriotism in a single stroke) and capital punishment; and, according to the *National Right to Life News* of January 22, 1988, "is militantly pro-abortion."

His running mate, Lloyd Bentsen, is regularly viewed as having been chosen to "balance the ticket" (Bentsen is ostensibly more conservative on a number of issues than Dukakis—but, then, who *isn't*?), to help Dukakis carry Texas and to strengthen his showing in other Southern States and in rural America. But Bentsen has other "credentials." He belongs to two important secret societies: the Freemasons and the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). Dukakis is not a CFR member but he clearly is of the same mind. No fewer than seven members of his campaign "brain trust" *are* CFR: Madeleine Albright, Graham Allison, Al Carnesale, Warren Christopher, Joseph Nye, Peter Tarnoff and Paul Warnke. Mr. Bentsen, we should note, is also decidedly pro-abortion.

When one turns to his Republican foe, George Bush, one can't escape the similarities: both are Ivy League, both wealthy (forget Dukakis' immigrant stories; his father, the first Greek to graduate from Harvard Medical School, had a practice that left the family very well off), and both uncharismatic technocrats. They even were born within ten miles of each other. But above all this, both are *owned* lock, stock and barrel by the same amoral conspiracy.

The eventual winner (either the untried newcomer or the obedient lackey who's "paid his dues") will ultimately be the one chosen *not* by the American electorate but by those pulling the strings behind the scenes. The powers of the media are so great to suppress relevant facts, to distort them, to underscore scandals, or *manufacture* or ignore them to subtly shape a voter's perception of the candidates, that political careers can be made or broken with relative ease. (Any reader doubting this had better investigate the press coverage of the following: Dwight Eisenhower, Joseph McCarthy, Jimmy Carter and, more recently, Evan Mecham and Gary Hart, to name a few.) And, given the Conspiracy's power, there may be times when a candidate, like a boxer in a fixed fight, is ordered to "take a dive."

It is said that the U.S. has a two-party system but what we really have are Party 1A and Party 1B, both corrupted to the core by an atheistic globalism that elevates the world-state to the status of a god. In the final analysis, be it George Bush or Michael Dukakis who is elected, the Conspiracy wins and we lose. †